

FUR0014-US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT/

In re the Application of:

HIROSHI USHIDA ET AL.

Serial No.: 09/761,756

Filed: January 18, 2001

For: SEI

SERVICE PROVIDING SYSTEM

AND METHOD USED THEREFOR

Art Unit: 2134

Examiner: Tran, Tongoc

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed August 13, 2004.

In the Office Action, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Teper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,665) in view of Shin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,134). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of the present application recites, among other things, that a user verification means of the user verification device determines whether or not a given user of a terminal device (e.g., a cellular telephone) is a registrant and, if so, transmits an access ticket for a requested service to the terminal device. That is, in accordance with the present invention, an access ticket for enabling access to a particular service provided by a website is transmitted to the user

Serial No.: 09/761,756 Attorney's Docket No.: FUR0014-US

Art Unit: 2134 Page 2

terminal device from the verification device. See, *e.g.*, Figure 9 of the present application. Step S605 of that figure shows that an access ticket is issued to a user terminal.

Significantly, in the present invention, the access ticket is <u>not</u> sent to the service providing website, but instead to the user terminal. Again, see figure 9.

One advantage of the methodology and system of the present invention is that a verification device and the service providing website do not need to manage a session ID to manage access tickets. As a result, in accordance with the present invention, the required time for verifying is relatively short, as the verification device does not need to contact the service providing website. That is, the system in accordance with the present invention separates the verification transaction from the delivery transaction.

In contrast, Teper discloses a system in which an access ticket is not transmitted to a user terminal, but is rather, transmitted to the service providing website. In Teper, the required time for verifying is relatively long (as compared to the present invention) because the verification device needs to contact the service providing website.

Independent claims 2, 9, 16 and 17 recite subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1 and, for at least the reasons discussed above, are all believed to be patentable over a combination of Teper et al. and Shin et al.

Claim 5 is believed to be patentable over the prior art of record for different reasons.

Claim 5 recites that a charge processing device is provided for performing charge processing when log information is received in response to issuance of an access ticket. See, *e.g.*, step S606 of figure 9. Thus, in the present invention, it is possible to preclude unfair charges to the end

Serial No.: 09/761,756

Art Unit: 2134

Attorney's Docket No.: FUR0014-US

Page 3

user by the service providing website. For example, it is possible that the service providing website might accept the purchase of goods from the user for \$1.00, but bills \$10.00 to the user, as is possible in the system described by Teper. In contrast, the present invention is able to prevent such fraud because any bill that is charged to a user is based on the access ticket which is provided by the user verification device, not the service providing website.

Since neither Teper et al. nor Shin et al., discloses or suggests express limitations recited in the claims of the present application as detailed above, Applicants respectfully request that the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-17 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Should the Examiner have any questions or determine any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP 1650 Tysons Boulevard McLean, VA 22102

Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: December 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

HIROSHI USHIDA ET AL.

Registration No. 32,329

Customer No. 28970

Document #: 1308096 v.1